



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/560,109	01/17/2006	Calin Turcanu	PI712US00	2893
30671	7590	03/02/2010		
DITTHAVONG MORI & STEINER, P.C.		EXAMINER		
918 Prince Street		LAM, DUNG LE		
Alexandria, VA 22314		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2617		
NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
03/02/2010	ELECTRONIC			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket@dcpatent.com

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/560,109	TURCANU, CALIN	
	Examiner DUNG LAM	Art Unit 2617	

All Participants: **Status of Application:** _____

(1) DUNG LAM. (3) _____.

(2) Jennifer Teng. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 22 February 2010

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

The amended limitations of claim 1 was discussed.

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/VINCENT P. HARPER/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

The examiner called the attorney to clarify the meaning and where the amended limitation "deleting the user's selection of the ad-hoc group from the phonebook" is supported in the specification. The attorney referred the examiner to Figure 4 and 5 and stated that since the group was customized selected from the phonebook, the deletion of the custom built ad hoc group would imply the deletion of the selection to one of ordinary skill in the art..